

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

CYPRESS INSURANCE COMPANY, as  
subrogee of Microsoft Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SK HYNIX AMERICA INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00467-RAJ

**OMNIBUS ORDER**

This order addresses the admission of Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 383 and 384, Plaintiff's motions for judgment as a matter of law, and Defendant's motion for judgment of a matter of law.

**A. Plaintiff's Exhibit Nos. 383 and 384**

Plaintiff's Exhibit No. 383 is **ADMITTED** by stipulation of the parties. The Court will also **ADMIT** Plaintiff's Exhibit 384 (RFA Nos. 43-50) subject to redactions. The Court requires Plaintiff to redact the objections to Request for Admission Nos. 43-50, so that each response begins with: "SKHA states as follows ...."

**B. Plaintiff's Motions for Judgment as a Matter of Law**

Plaintiff's moved for judgment as a matter of law on Day 9 of trial. Dkt. # 273. The Court rules as follows:

**i. Breach of the Buffer Inventory**

Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no

1 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on the issue of  
2 damages.

3 **ii. Voluntary Payor Affirmative Defense**

4 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no  
5 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on this issue.

6 **iii. Impracticability Affirmative Defense**

7 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no  
8 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on this issue.

9 **iv. Pre-Incident Conduct**

10 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Defendant, however, is precluded from referencing  
11 comparative fault or pre-incident conduct in closing arguments as a basis for reducing  
12 damages for breach of contract.

13 **v. Subsequent Delivery of DRAM chips**

14 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no  
15 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on that issue as  
16 it pertains to delivery under the Ninth Amendment.

17 **vi. Breach of the Capacity Commitment (Table 3) of the Ninth**  
18 **Amendment**

19 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no  
20 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on the issue of  
21 commercial reasonableness.

22 **vii. Breach of Ninth Amendment Regarding Purchase Orders**

23 Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no  
24 legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Hynix on this issue.

25 //

26 //

27 //

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

**i. Breach of Pricing Table of Ninth Amendment**

Defendant's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Cypress on this issue.

Defendant's motion is **DENIED**. Disputed facts preclude finding that there is no legally sufficient evidentiary basis for a reasonable jury to find for Cypress on this issue.

  
The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
United States District Judge

The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
United States District Judge